



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/663,907	09/17/2003	. Ying Tat Leung	YOR920030350 (00280746AA)	2648	
	7590 03/30/200 URTIS & CHRISTOFI	EXAMINER			
11491 SUNSET	HILLS ROAD	CHEN, TE Y			
SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 2	20190		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2161		
SHORTENED STATUTORY	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS 03/30/2007			PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2007. 2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. 3]□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 ⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5 □ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are allowed. 6 ⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7 □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9 □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10 □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Susan Y. Chen Susan Y. Chen Susan Y. Chen Susan Y. Chen 2161	Office Action Summary		10/663,9	07 .	LEUNG ET AL.	LEUNG ET AL.			
The MALING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address - Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Eatherwise of time may be available under the provisions of 3 CPR 1.30(s), inne event, nowers, may reply be intended and in the communication of the provision of 3 CPR 1.30(s), inne event, nowers, may reply be intended and of this communication. If NO pariod for reply is appoiled above, the months after the mailing date of the communication. Follows to reply which the side or careful period for reply is appoiled above, the months after the mailing date of the communication, even if simily find, may reduce any application is provided by the foliation of the policy of the policy of the period of the communication, even if simily find, may reduce any application is provided by the provided by the provided period for reply in application is provided by the provided period for reply in application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Sclaim(s)			Examine	r	Art Unit				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - after Six (s) MONTHS been the mailting date of this communication. - in the Six (s) MONTHS been the mailting date of this communication, or early the stimuly flead - if No pard for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory protein day pay and will expire X(s) (s) MONTHS been the mailting date of this communication, reply and the spire of the pays and the spire X(s) MONTHS the mailting date of this communication, even if timely fleed, may return adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) ☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2007. 2a) ☑ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This action is Final. 3) ☑ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) ☑ Claim(s) 1.10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are allowed. 5) ☑ Claim(s) 1.10 is/are allowed. 5) ☑ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 7) ☑ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☑ Claim(s) is/are objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The gracification is objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 9) ☑ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 10 ☑ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) (d) or (f). a) ☐ All by ☐ Some * C ☐ None of: 1 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3 ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2 ☐ Certified copies of the priority document									
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Editions to them may be available under the provision of 3°C FR 1.15(a), in no event, however, may a regly be finely filed after SX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failthe to recy with the tast or event and the provision of the provisio									
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2007. 2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4)☑ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5)□ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are allowed. 6)☑ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to by the Examiner. 10)□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10)□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application. from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(e) 1)□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)□ Information Disclosure Statements() (PTO/SB008)	WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the	NG DATE OF TI CFR 1.136(a). In no ex- tion. period will apply and w y statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICA vent, however, may a rep vill expire SIX (6) MONTI Dication to become ABA	ATION. Oly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this of NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5 Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6 Claim(s) is/are allowed. 7 Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 Claim(s) is/are objected to. 9 The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10 The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 9 The specification is objected to by the Examiner. Application and trawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:	Status								
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4 Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5 Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6 Claim(s) is/are allowed. 7 Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 Claim(s) is/are objected to. 9 The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10 The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 9 The specification is objected to by the Examiner. Application and trawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:	1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	n 13 February 20	07.					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4)	·								
A) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1 □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2 □ Notice of Informal Patent Application Notice of Informal Patent Application	3)□	Since this application is in condition for a	allowance except	for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the	e merits is			
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application. from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mall Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application		·— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application. from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1 □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3 □ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S8/08) 5 □ Notice of Informal Patent Application	Dispositi	on of Claims							
5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application	4)⊠								
Solution (Solution (Solut		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Informal Patent Application 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	5)	<u> </u>							
Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filled on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S8/08)	6)⊠								
Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	7)[Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election r	equirement.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application	Applicati	on Papers							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	9)[The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some colonome colon	10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[accepted or b	objected to b	y the Examiner.				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Notice of Informal Patent Application		Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s)	be held in abeyanc	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 10 Notice of Informal Patent Application	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 1 Notice of Informal Patent Application	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)									
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application.from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application		1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 1 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application		2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Solution		3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application									
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Informal Patent Application	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Informal Patent Application									
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Informal Patent Application	Attachmen	t(e)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application	_ ``								
-, <u>— </u>	2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	48)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date					

Response to Amendment

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Feb 13, 2007 has been entered.

Claims 1-10 are pending for examination. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 -10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claims 1 and 6, applicant fails to define the metes and bounds of claimed "each component in the equipments" (i.e., does it referred to a software component or hardware component or both?), thus, it renders the claims as indefinite.

Art Unit: 2161

. As to claims 2-5 and 7-10, these claims have the same defects as their base claims, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Because the ambiguous nature of instant invention, the following art rejection is as to the best of the examiner ascertain.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0250166 issued to Dahlquist et al. (hereinafter referred as Dahlquist).

Claim 1:

Dahlquist discloses the method to diagnose equipment failures using an integrated approach of case-based reasoning and reliability analysis [e.g., Abstract, Fig(s) 1-7 and associated texts], comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2161

maintaining a case base database for the equipment [e.g., the units: 31, 35 of Fig. 2; 24, Fig. 3 and 24, Fig. 4 and associated texts];

receiving an equipment problem description from a user [e.g., the units: 22, 23, 25, etc, Fig. 3 and associated texts; page 2, the sections: 0027-0031 & page 4, sections 0050-0052];

for each component in the equipment, calculating failure probability based on at least one of historical failure and published failure data of the components [e.g., the use of analyzer function to analysis any component of the processing and calculating the component failure probability via probabilistic methods over simulated data & Historical Plant data stored on case based Reasoning searching failure library (e.g., Fig. 2) at page 2, Sections: 0029-0031, Page 4, sections 0053-0055];

for each component, calculating probability of matching problem description assuming that a component fails, using case based reasoning [e.g., the case based reasoning unit 35 of Fig. 2, and the unit 35 of Fig. 5 and associated texts & Page 4, section 0056];

for each component, combining the calculated probabilities to compute an overall failure probability given the historical failure data and published data and the problem description problem description [e.g., page 2, Sections: 0029-0031, Page 4, sections 0053-0057, Fig(s) 2-4 and associated texts]; and

composing a list of component recommendations by ranking components by their overall failure probabilities and retrieving corresponding past solutions from the case

base database [e.g., Page 1, sections: 0005- 0012 & Page 4, section 0053, Fig. 6 and associated texts].

Claim 2:

In addition to the features recited in claim 1, Dahlquist further discloses that the step of producing a single list of suggested failed components based on historical failure data and published failure data as observed by the equipment user, and the problem description received from the user [e.g., Fig. 6 and associated texts & Page 6, section 0076].

Claim 3:

In addition to the features recited in claim 1, Dahlquist further discloses that the step of producing a list of probabilities of failure corresponding to the list of suggested failed components, with the probabilities estimated from historical failure data and published failure data, as observed by the equipment user, and the problem description received from the user [e.g., Fig. (s) 2 & 6 and associated texts].

Claim 4:

In addition to the features recited in claim 1, Dahlquist further discloses that the step of combining probabilities to compute the overall failure probability for each component uses an equipment hierarchy such that component failure probabilities are estimated in a hierarchical manner, calculated from data for the equipment at hand, if

Art Unit: 2161

there is adequate data, otherwise, from data from an equipment group one level up in the hierarchy, and repeating the process until adequate data is found [e.g., Page 6, sections: 0082-0087 & the top-down plant hierarchy by case based reasoning for fault detection, or the vertical down-up plant hierarchy by Bayesian inference for root cause analyzing of Fig(s). 5-7 and associated texts].

Claim 5:

In addition to the features recited in claim 1, Dahlquist further discloses that the step of combining probabilities to compute overall failure probability uses an equipment hierarchy such that historical cases are retrieved in a hierarchical manner, from data for the equipment at hand, if there is adequate data, otherwise, from data from an equipment group one level up in the hierarchy, and repeating the process until adequate data is found [e.g., Page 4, sections: 0054-0055, Page 5, sections: 0063-0065, Page 6, sections: 0082-0083 & Fig(s). 4-7 and associated texts].

Claim 6:

Dahlquist discloses a decision support system to diagnose equipment failures using an integrated approach of case-based reasoning and reliability analysis [e.g., Abstract, Fig(s) 1-7 and associated texts], comprising:

a case base maintenance management system database for the equipment; a decision support system database [e.g., the unit: 31, Fig. 2; 24, Fig. 3 and 24, Fig. 4 and associated texts];

Art Unit: 2161

a decision support system client for receiving an equipment problem description from a user [e.g., the units: 22, 23, 25, etc, Fig. 3 and associated texts; page 2, the sections: 0027-0031 & page 4, sections 0050-0052];

a decision support system server receiving input from the decision support system client and accessing said case base maintenance management system database and said decision support system database, said decision support system server including [e.g., Fig. (s) 2-7 and associated texts]:

a real-time decision support system engine for calculating failure probability for each component in the equipment, based on historical failure data and published failure data of each of the component, using reliability theory, and for calculating probability of matching problem description for each component, assuming that a component fails, using case based reasoning, and for each component, combining the calculated the calculated probabilities to compute the overall failure probability for each component given the historical failure data and published failure data of each of the component and the equipment problem description and composing a list of component recommendations by ranking components by their overall failure probabilities and retrieving corresponding past solutions from the case base maintenance management system database [e.g., Page 5, section 0070 - page 6, section 0076 & Fig.(s) 3-6 and associated texts]; and

a case base update processor for copying closed failure transaction records from the case base maintenance management systems database, and

extracting the information from these transaction records to obtain the attributes required by said real-time decision support system engine, and indexing each transaction record by the failed component identification and the number of occurrence of failure of that particular component [e.g., the database 24 real-time updating at Page 5, section 0070-0071, the diagnostics data extracting at Page 5, sections: 0063-0065, the hierarchical indices of the case based decision control system (DCS) at Page 6, sections: 0079-0085 & the ranking, propagating and replacing "the malfunctioning pump with a new one technique" of the decision support tool at Page 7, section 0091-0095, Fig.(s) 2-7 and associated texts].

Claim 7:

In addition to the features recited in claim 6, Dahlquist further discloses that the decision support system server produces a single list of suggested failed components based on historical failure data and published failure data of each of the components as observed by the equipment user, and the problem description received from the user [e.g., Fig. 6 and associated texts & Page 6, section 0076].

Claim 8:

In addition to the features recited in claim 6, Dahlquist further discloses that the decision support system server produces a list of probabilities of failure corresponding to the list of suggested failed components, with the probabilities estimated from

historical failure data and published failure data of each of the components as observed by the equipment user, and the problem description received from the user [e.g., Fig. (s) 2 & 6 and associated texts].

Claim 9:

In addition to the features recited in claim 6, Dahlquist further discloses that the decision support system server combines the probability of matching the equipment problem description for each component to compute the overall failure probability for each component using an equipment hierarchy such that the overall failure probability for each component is estimated in a hierarchical manner, calculated from data for the equipment at hand, if there is adequate data, otherwise, from data from an equipment group one level up in the hierarchy, and repeats the process until adequate data is found [e.g., Page 6, sections: 0082-0087 & the top-down plant hierarchy by case based reasoning for fault detection, or the down-up plant hierarchy by Bayesian inference for root cause analyzing of Fig(s). 5-7 and associated texts].

<u>Claim 10:</u>

In addition to the features recited in claim 6, Dahlquist further discloses that the decision support system server combines the probability of matching the equipment problem description for each of the components to compute the overall failure probability for each component using an equipment hierarchy such that historical cases are retrieved in a hierarchical manner, from data for the equipment at hand, if there is

adequate data, otherwise, from data from an equipment group one level up in the hierarchy, and repeats the process until adequate data is found [e.g., Page 4, sections: 0054-0055, Page 5, sections: 0063-0065, Page 6, sections: 0082-0083 & Fig(s). 4-7 and associated texts].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on Feb. 13, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments and piece-meal interpretation under the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejections, that are summarized as following:

1) Both claims 1 and 6 requires the use of case-based reasoning and reliability analysis in an integrated fashion. Dahlquist wholly lacks the feature of application of case based reasoning and analysis of historical failure data and published data in an integrated fashion to composing a list of component recommendations ranked by their overall failure probabilities.

In response to the above arguments, the examiner first points out that MPEP § 2106 requires Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The examiner notes that applicant fails to define the metes and bounds of claimed "each component in the equipments", "published failure data" and "problem description", as such, the claimed limitations are open for reasonable art interpretation.

Furthermore, Dahlquist clearly disclosed the use of case-based reasoning [e.g., the unit 35, Fig(s). 2&5 and associated texts] and reliability analysis [e.g., the unit 25, Fig(s). 2-3 and associated texts] in an integrated fashion to composing a list of component recommendations ranked by their overall failure probabilities [e.g., The Integration of the results of the analysis with the maintenance system and equipment data as recited in Sections: 0005-0012]. Thereby, in contrary to applicant's arguments, Dahlquist clearly anticipates the claimed limitations recited in claims 1 and 6.

In response to applicant's arguments with respect to the limitations of claims 4 and 9 that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the hierarchy is only exercised if insufficient data is found at the lowest level of the hierarchy) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Moreover, even they were recited in these claims, they are met by the on-line decision support "root cause" analyzing tool of Dahlquist, wherein each component of a causality network is organized in hierarchical level for dynamically populating associated equipment components if insufficient data is found at the lowest component level based on the conditional probabilities modeled by cause-effect relations of the Bayesian network, such that the tool can be activated by an operator only when the operator desires to perform "root cause" effective analysis to follow each causality chained up to the component level in order to find the root cause,

wherein, the uncertainties caused in the root analysis, are definitely taken into account, for example, by information signals from other sources not associated with the malfunction via the case reasoning function [e.g., Fig. 7 and associated texts of Dahlquist].

As to the rest of arguments applicant merely rehashes issued already addressed on record, thus, based on the discussion above, the rejections on record are maintained.

Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Y Chen

Examiner

Examiner Art Unit 2161 Se Mulher

March 26, 2007